



**Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in
Higher Education**

Republic of Cyprus

External Evaluation Report

Institutional Evaluation

Institution: School of Automotive Engineering

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Instructions.....	3
External Evaluation Committee (EEC).....	4
Introduction.....	5
Findings.....	6
Conclusions and Suggestions of the External Evaluation Committee.....	17
Document Number: 300.2.....	18

INSTRUCTIONS:

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 to 2016” [N. 136 (I)/2015 and 47 (I)/2016].

The document is duly completed by the External Evaluation Committee for Institutional Evaluation. The ANNEX (Doc. Number 300.2) constitutes an integral part of the external evaluation report.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

NAME	TITLE / ACADEMIC POSITION	UNIVERSITY / INSTITUTION
Prof Manolis Gavaises	Professor	City, University of London, UK
Prof Julian Dunne	Professor	Sussex University, UK
Prof John Allport	Professor	University of Huddersfield, UK
Mr Konstantinos Odysseos	Student	Cyprus University of Technology
Dr Christos Efstathiadis	Civil Engineer	Technical Chamber of Cyprus
Ms Katerina Evangelou	Student welfare officer	University of Cyprus

INTRODUCTION:

I. The External Evaluation procedure

- Short description of the documents that have been studied, of the on-site visit meetings, and of the on-site visit to the infrastructures.

1. Programme of study
2. Application for institutional evaluation
3. Visit to the site (School premises, classrooms, drawing room, vehicle and engine workshops 'Rafael' close to FORUM)
4. Agreement for use of premises
5. Plan of what is included in the Agreement of use
6. Stamped plans of the building premises
7. Certificates for adequate electrical installation (part of the building)
8. Fire safety certificate
9. List certificate
10. Υπηρεσία Σπουδών και Φοιτητικής Μέριμνας (in Greek only)

II. The Internal Evaluation procedure

- Comments concerning the quality and the comprehensiveness of the application submitted by the institution of higher education (Doc. Number 200.2), as well as on the overall response to, and participation in the quality assurance procedures, on behalf of the institution.

The external panel has concluded that the internal evaluation procedure has been conducted by the same person(s) that have set-up the SoAE and have provided the relevant documentation.

Specifically, for the programme documentation, the external panel considers that parts of the documentation provided is not relevant to this particular application, suggesting it has been copied and pasted from other sources. For example, page 174 of the programme of studies document refers to the culinary arts programme and the intake of 80 students, which are clearly not applicable. Moreover, the programme of studies presented to the panel in Greek is different from the relevant documentation provided in English for year 1. As a result, the external panel has little confidence on the quality checks/assurance of the internal evaluation procedures.

With regards to the premises, it has to be noted that the plans of the RAFAHL workshop area have not been included in the internal evaluation.

FINDINGS:

1. INSTITUTION'S ACADEMIC PROFILE AND ORIENTATION

The panel considers that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the overall objective of the institution. However, a number of issues have been identified which are detailed in the following sections.

Mission and Strategic planning

The School's mission statement is not accurate and is completely misleading. The School will not graduate automotive engineers, as this term has a different meaning in the higher education sector in Cyprus and across the world; so it has to be replaced with a more appropriate term. Moreover, the School will not train professionals suited to the automotive industry; the graduates will be suited to the servicing and repair sector of the automotive aftermarket.

Similarly, the panel is concerned with the advertised school name, which is 'School of Automotive Engineering'. This is misleading for new students. The graduates will not be Automotive Engineers, they will be trained mechanics in the servicing and repair of automotive aftersales market.

The panel is also concerned that there is no consultation with any external advisory board or expert in this area. This is particularly important as the automotive area is changing quite fast. For example, there is an expected penetration of hybrid and electric vehicles into the market, which are currently not addressed by the presented programme. Moreover, there is no expertise of the existing teaching staff to meet the servicing needs for this area.

Connecting with society

The panel considers that there is no evidence of connection with the society, apart from the personal communication of the SoAE members and teachers. For example, there is no advisory board that can help in monitoring and improving the programme of studies and assessing the feedback to/from the students. Moreover, there is no evidence of a mechanism of communication with future graduates. Furthermore, they do not seem to have an advertisement mechanism of their School apart from their Website.

Overall, the panel considers that connection with society is limited to personal views and communication.

Development processes

The panel considers that there is no formal procedure in place for the recruitment of teachers/academic staff and students. There is no provision for a training plan and no budget is allocated to this. Moreover, there is no evidence for staff development or even a feedback mechanism that can help them improve over time.

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE

System and quality assurance strategy

There is no evidence of such a system or policy in place. Moreover, there is a possible conflict of interest as the quality assurance consultant is a member of faculty staff of the company.

Ensuring Quality for the Programmes of Study

There was no evidence of a mechanism ensuring the quality of programme of study. Moreover, the panel considers that the currently proposed programme is problematic in a number of areas (details are given below).

3. ADMINISTRATION

The day-to-day administration seems to be working. However, there was no evidence of formal documentation of the policy or regulations to cover all aspects of the operation of the School.

4. TEACHING AND LEARNING

Planning the Programmes of Study

The proposed programme of studies seems to be copy-pasted from internet sources and does not correspond to the one presented in the Greek language. More specific issues are addressed below.

Moreover, there was no evidence of planning/improving/updating the programme of studies for the follow-up years. This includes both level and quality.

The panel concluded that the programme of studies is not in compliance with the legislation and level of professional qualification requirements for the proposed Level-4 courses.

Teaching Organization

The teaching organization seems to be based on the ability of the individual teachers. There is no evidence of feedback from the students or any other qualified expert. There was no external committee to review the programme and the possible teaching organization. Moreover, some of the content appears to be inappropriate for that type of programme.

5. ACADEMIC AND TEACHING STAFF

Suitability of Academic and Teaching Staff

The panel concluded that the teaching staff to be employed are suitable for the designed programme. Some seem to have prior experience, and some are relatively new. Most seem to be keen to contribute to teaching in the School and have spoken positively about their experience so far. The panel concluded that they are suitable to teach in the proposed programme.

Qualifications

The panel concluded that the levels of qualification of the teaching staff do not meet the legal requirements. Five out of the eleven (45%) teaching staff only have a diploma; this is a higher than the 30% permitted from the relevant regulations.

6. RESEARCH

This is not applicable.

7. RESOURCES

The panel considers that the programme is properly resourced from a teaching perspective for the first year of operation and presumably for the following 2 years, with the expected number of students.

However, as the number of students is expected to grow, the additional needs for administration, pastoral, teaching staff, rooms and workshops are not properly planned or resourced. Moreover, there is no plan for re-investment in workshops, equipment, library facilities and possible future software requirements (like drawing packages). Furthermore, there is insufficient future provision planned for assessing students with learning disabilities. There is no plan to appoint an external advisory committee or experts needed to assess the programme evolution.

8. BUILDING FACILITIES

Instructions: Please note whether the following are considered satisfactory / sufficient for the institution to function properly and to achieve its objectives.

INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE	YES / NO
<p>1. The following should be copies from the original building permit. On the copies, there should be a visible official stamp of approval from the respective authorities.</p> <p>1.1 A topographical plan which displays in a clear manner the extent of the development.</p> <p>1.2 A general site plan which marks the building facilities, allocated parking spaces (for students, academic and teaching personnel, visitors and disabled individuals), sports premises and outdoor areas.</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>NO</p>
<p>2. LICENCES</p> <p>2.1 An Operating License, issued by the <i>Local Authorities</i></p> <p>2.2 The following Operating License Certificates, duly completed:</p> <p>a) Visual Inspection Form E.O.E. 102</p> <p>b) Visual Inspection for the Building's Seismic Sufficiency Form E.O.E.Σ.E.K 103</p> <p>c) Inspection Certificate Form 104</p> <p>d) Fire Safety Certificate, issued by the <i>Fire Department</i></p> <p>e) Certificate for Adequate Electrical and Mechanical Installations, issued by the <i>Electromechanical Department</i>.</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p>

3. Number of teaching rooms and their respective areas, capacity and the percentage of daily occupancy for all units.	YES
4. Number of offices for academic personnel and their respective areas and capacity.	NO
5. Number of laboratories and their respective areas and capacity.	NO
6. Number of rooms/offices for directors/administrators and their respective areas and capacity.	YES
7. Number of rooms/offices for administrative services and their respective areas and capacity.	YES
8. Parking spaces designated for students Number: Ten (10) parking places for use from the students and the academic/teaching/administrative staff of the school.	YES
9. Parking spaces designated for academic and teaching personnel Number: Ten (10) parking places for use from the students and the academic/teaching/administrative staff of the school.	YES

<p>Remarks / Justification</p> <p>1.1 There is a topographical map that displays the extent of the development of the whole secondary school (FORUM), not only the premises that the applicants have an agreement to use. The plan is from the building permit (ΛΕΥ / 1890 / 2005). During the site visit, the panel visited two workshops (in two different buildings) with total area of about 675m² at a location close to submitted development (FORUM school). However, these premises are not included in the application. These workshops are labelled as ‘RAFAHL workshop’ in this document.</p> <p>1.2 The points (a-d) below need to be clarified in written format: a. The applicants are planning to use part of the premises of FORUM secondary school. In the application there are plans of the whole school with some premises marked with yellow (supposed to be the premises that the applicants have an agreement to use). The marked premises are not in line with agreement (that was requested and a copy was given during the site visit, and which is not included in the submitted documents).</p> <p>b. The school has several infrastructures but what is written in the “agreement of use” does not correspond with the application.</p>
--

c. Among others the application indicates teaching rooms in a non (so far) existing building, more than 30 parking places, meeting rooms etc., whereas the “agreement of use” states different rooms/areas.

d. During the site visit explanations were given and it was clarified that the “agreement of use” overrides the plans and so all the following are based in the “agreement of use”. Furthermore, it has to be mentioned that most of the premises (including teaching rooms) have “agreement of use” **only for afternoon classes** (15:00 – 21:30).

2.1 The premises inside the FORUM complex have a building permit (Nicosia District Officer, 002668) for use as a “Secondary Level Private School”.

2.2 All certificates provided are related with the whole premises of the secondary school and not only with those the applicants have “agreement of use”. Regarding “Certificate for Adequate Electrical and Mechanical Installations” issued by the Electromechanical Department, Certificate for Adequate Electrical Installations were presented for part of the premises (whole school) whereas Certificate for Adequate Mechanical Installations were not presented (except lift inspection report). The Fire Safety Certificate is dated from 2012.

3. Three teaching rooms will be available **only for afternoon classes** (15:00 – 21:30). The number of rooms allocated are: 1 for 2018-2019, 2 for 2019-2020 and 3 for 2020-2021; each has an area of about 40m² with capacity of 24 students.

4. There are no offices for academic personnel.

5. A laboratory for “Design and technology” of about 45m² that will be available for the afternoon hours (15:00 – 21:30). There is not any special equipment available in this laboratory. The necessary equipment is located in the workshops that are not included in the application.

6. The “agreement of use” includes one office of 20 m² for whole day use (07:30 – 21:30) from the Director of the school. At the current plans the room is described as “doctors room”.

7. The “agreement of use” includes one office with area of 15 m² for whole day use (07:30 – 21:30) for administrative services of the school. At the current plans the room is described as “psychologist room”.

8 & 9. The “agreement of use” includes ten parking places for use from the students and the teaching staff of the school. This can be considered to be proper for the first year (about 20 students). The whole premises of FORUM complex include about 60 parking places, which if become partially available (up to 30), are adequate to host the number of students expected when in full capacity.

9. STUDENT WELFARE SERVICES

	YES/NO
1. Special access for students with disabilities (PWD)	YES
2. Recreation areas	YES
3. Policy and statutes for academic student support	YES
4. Policy and statutes for financial student support	YES

5. Counseling services	YES
6. Career office	YES
7. Service linking the institution with business	YES
8. Mobility office	NO
9. Student clubs/organisations/associations	NO
10. Other services	

Please justify this review and note the additional comments you may have on each of the above items.

The structure of School of Automotive Engineering, at this stage, in addition to the small number of students (20 students per year) does not allow the existence of separate offices with specialized personnel for the support and counselling of students as in other higher education institutions e.g. Social Worker, Psychologist Counselor, Student Affairs Officer, Career Officer, etc.

Currently, all of the above student welfare services are provided by a qualified Psychologist who holds a Master Degree in School Counseling and Guidance and an Administration assistant.

Special access for students with disabilities:

The institution ensures equal access to academic studies for students with disabilities. However, due to the nature of the profession, students with a disability must be well informed, before registering, about the training part of the degree, as well as the responsibilities they will have in order to obtain the degree.

Recreation areas:

The institution uses the new premises of FORUM Private high school. According to the signed agreement, students of the institution can use the restaurant and all the recreational areas daily from 15:00 – 21:30.

Policy and statutes for academic student support:

As stated, upon admission students will have their Academic Advisor who will provide them with all the necessary academic advice and guidance throughout their studies. Due to the small number of students, instructors will have direct contact with students offering them immediate academic support.

Policy and statutes for financial student support:

The institution offers 2 scholarships per year at each level, based on academic, social and financial criteria. Also, as stated, if students have difficulties in paying off their tuitions the institution offers them with flexible payment methods. Some companies also offer sponsorships to SoAE students.

Counseling services:

Students in need of psychological or other counselling services can contact the Psychologist for private guidance and support.

Career office:

The Psychologist and the administrative assistant deal with informing students and graduates vacancies related to their field of studies. The psychologist also provides essential services in personal guidance and development and guides students how to prepare for a job interview and write a CV.

As stated, the career office organises workshops, events and seminars to help students identify and develop their skills throughout the year.

Service linking the institution with business:

SoAE has several collaborations within the automotive servicing aftermarket.

Mobility office:

The institution aims to participate in the students ERASMUS exchange program at a later stage.

Student clubs/organisations/associations:

The institution aims to encourage students in creating student clubs according to their interests in order to gain experience, socialization and culture development. Students will organize excursions, events and various other recreational and artistic activities.

10. INFRASTRUCTURE

INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE	YES/NO
1. Library	YES
2. Computers available for use by the students	YES
3. Technological support	YES
4. Technical support	YES

Please justify this review and note the additional comments you may have on each of the above items.

1. There is limited number of books and online catalogues. Resources depend mainly on open access internet sources
2. The PCs available are mainly for internet access. If they are to extend the modules to include drawing packages, then they are probably not adequate
3. It is provided by the FORUM IT services
4. It is provided by the FORUM IT services

CONCLUSIONS AND RELATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE¹

- The current situation of the institution, good practices, weaknesses which have been identified in the process of institutional evaluation by the External Evaluation Committee, suggestions for improvement.

The panel conducted a site visit and a thorough review of the documents provided, according to the regulations. Panel members asked a wide range of questions, which not only allowed the answers to the above questions to be determined but went beyond that, to understand the specific details and peculiarities of the specific School under evaluation. The following have been concluded:

Positive points:

1. It seems there is a demand in training students in the area of servicing and repair; as the technology in the automotive sector is changing fast, qualified technicians will be needed.

Thus, the panel considers that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the overall objective of the institution.

2. The stakeholders of the School and the teaching staff seem to be enthusiastic and committed to the overall objective.

3. The premises are conveniently/centrally located within Cyprus with easy access from the major cities of Nicosia, Limassol and Larnaca.

4. The premises seems to be adequately equipped and have the space to be updated for addressing future needs.

5. Currently, the student welfare services are provided by a qualified Psychologist who holds a Master Degree in School Counselling and Guidance and an Administration assistant.

Areas of concern in direct conflict with the regulations:

1. The panel concluded that the levels of qualification of the teaching staff do not meet the legal requirements. Five out of eleven teaching staff (45%) have a diploma; this gives a percentage that higher than the 30% specified in the relevant regulations.

2. The part of premises that the applicants will be able to use from the FORUM school needs to be clarified in writing and include what is stated in the agreement (the copy that was given during the site visit). The same applies for the offices for academic personnel, the room for technical design and the parking places. Regarding the workshops (or laboratories), the one submitted (laboratory for "Design

¹ It is highlighted, at this point, that the External Evaluation Committee is expected to justify its findings and its suggestions on the basis of the Document num.: 300.2. The External Evaluation Committee is not expected to submit a suggestion for the approval or the rejection of the program of study under evaluation. This decision falls under the competencies of the Council of the Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher education.

and technology”) is clearly not satisfactory. During the site visit, the RAFAHL workshop was presented, but this is not included in the application (no information, licences, certificates etc. were submitted for those premises).

3. The panel has concluded that the provided programme of studies in English is probably bought in from an outside source and it is different from the one presented in the Greek language. In many cases the provided English text is not applicable at all.

4. The School’s mission statement is not accurate and is completely misleading. The School will not graduate automotive engineers, as this term has a different meaning in the higher education sector in Cyprus and across the world; so it has to be replaced with a more appropriate term. Moreover, the School will not train professionals suited to the automotive industry; the graduates will be suited to the servicing and repair sector of the automotive aftermarket.

Areas of concern/weaknesses for the long-term operation:

1. The planning of resources for the future expansion of the School (increased number of students) is not properly done, which may lead to financial uncertainties that the current panel cannot assess.

2. The level of academic courses proposed is not appropriate in some cases. For example, the level of maths given in the syllabus is too simple to allow students to address other modules, like thermodynamics and basic mechanics. There is no provision of very basic chemistry to obtain understanding of combustion and engine emissions. There is no provision for AutoCAD or other drawing packages. Similarly, the various practical exercises are limited to existing equipment, which do not allow further development that will help students to understand the engine/vehicle operation. In short, it seems there is lack of academic leadership in the designed programme of studies. Along the same lines, some modules seem to be totally inappropriate. For example, *SAE103*, *SAE302*, *SAE306* are excessively long and they could be easily combined to one.

3. The lack of procedures for assessment criteria and feedback to/from the students and to/from the teaching staff.

4. The panel concluded that successful operation will strongly benefit from assistance of experts with engine and vehicle monitoring experience, that have a wide knowledge of the relevant technologies and the future trends. Similarly, an independent advisory board would greatly help the operation.

5. The panel is concerned with regards to the logo and layout of SoAE, which looks identical to SAE (the Society of Automotive Engineers), the largest international organisation on engines and vehicles with thousands of members. The panel is concerned that this is misleading for the possible students that may think there is a link between the two.

6. Similarly, the advertised school title ‘School of Automotive Engineering’ is misleading and not appropriate. The graduates of the SoAE will not be Automotive

Engineers, they will be mechanics in the servicing and repair sector of the automotive aftersales market.

7. The panel was concerned that a number of aspects with regards to the training and qualifications of the students cannot be evaluated until the first cohort of students has graduated. The panel recommends that an accreditation exercise should be performed after that date.

8. The structure of the School of Automotive Engineering, at this stage, in addition to the small number of students (20 students per year) does not allow the existence of separate offices with specialized personnel for the support and counselling of students as in other higher education institutions e.g. Social Worker, Psychologist Counsellor, Student Affairs Officer, Career Officer, etc.

**Quality Standards and Indicators
Institutional Evaluation**

Institution: School of Automotive Engineering

Date of External Evaluation: 28-30 June 2018

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 and 2016” [N. 136 (I)/2015 and N. 47(I)/2016].

The document describes the quality standards and indicators applied for institutional evaluation by the External Evaluation Committee.

DIRECTIONS: Note what is applicable for each quality standard/indicator.

1. Applicable to a minimum degree
2. Applicable to a non-satisfactory degree
3. Applicable to a satisfactory degree
4. Applicable to a very satisfactory degree
5. It applies and it constitutes a good practice

It is highlighted that, in the case of standards and indicators that cannot be applied due to the status of the institution, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the institution’s corresponding policy regarding the specific quality standard or indicator.

Members of the External Evaluation Committee

NAME	TITLE / ACADEMIC POSITION	INSTITUTION / BODY
Prof Manolis Gavaises	Professor	City, University of London, UK
Prof Julian Dunne	Professor	Sussex University, UK
Prof John Allport	Professor	University of Huddersfield, UK
Mr Konstantinos Odysseos	Student	Cyprus University of Technology
Dr Christos Efstathiadis	Civil Engineer	Technical Chamber of Cyprus
Ms Katerina Evangelou	Student welfare officer	University of Cyprus

Date and time of the on-site visit: 28 June 2018

Duration of the on-site visit: 1 day

1. INSTITUTION'S ACADEMIC PROFILE AND ORIENTATION						
1.1	Mission and Strategic planning	1	2	3	4	5
1.1.1	The Institution has formally adopted a mission statement which is available to the public and easily accessible.				x	
1.1.2	The Institution has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.				x	
1.1.3	The Institution's Strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.				x	
1.1.4	The offered Programmes of Study align with the aims and objectives of the Institution's development.				x	
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Institution's development strategies.		x			
1.1.6	In the Institution's development strategy, interested parties such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Institution's development strategy.	x				
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Institution's academic development is adequate and effective.	x				
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>1.1.5 It's probably not applicable (not an academic institution). However, nobody else has been involved</p> <p>1.1.6 There is no information on others being involved</p> <p>1.1.7 There is no mechanism for collecting and analysing data at any level</p>						
1.2	Connecting with society	1	2	3	4	5
1.2.1	The Institution has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	x				
1.2.2	The Institution provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered Programmes of Study.				x	
1.2.3	The Institution ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.			x		
1.2.4	The Institution has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	x				
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>1.2.1 They have their own views probably and experience from customers but there is no advisory board or other means to know the broader market trends</p> <p>1.2.4 There are no graduates yet, so this cannot be assessed. Still, there is no evidence of any future procedure/plan to communicate with the graduates</p>						

1.3	Development processes	1	2	3	4	5
1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select academic staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, research and effectively carry out their work.	x				
1.3.2	The institution has a two-year growth budget that is consistent with its strategic planning.					x
1.3.3	Planning academic staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Institution's academic development plan.		x			
1.3.4	The Institution applies an effective strategy of attracting students / high-level students from Cyprus.		x			
1.3.5	The Institution applies an effective strategy to attract high-level students from abroad.		x			
1.3.6	The funding processes for the operation of the Institution and the continuous improvement of the quality of its Programmes of Study are adequate and transparent.			x		
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>1.3.1 There is no evidence of formal procedures 1.3.3 There is no evidence of staff professional development 1.3.4 Only the web site exists, there is no evidence of other mechanism 1.3.5 No evidence of any strategy</p> <p>Additionally, write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expected number of Cypriot and foreign students. Approximately 20 students per year - Countries of origin of foreign students and number from each country. Possibly no other countries 						

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE						
2.1	System and quality assurance strategy	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.1	The committee and the internal quality assurance system work systematically and effectively.		x			
2.1.2	Quality assurance policies are being developed with the active engagement of interested parties.			x		
2.1.3	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Institution's activities:		x			
	2.1.3.1 The teaching and learning	x				
	2.1.3.2 Research	x				
	2.1.3.3 The connection with society		x			
	2.1.3.4 Management and support services		x			
2.1.4	The Quality Assurance system promotes a culture of quality.		x			
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>2.1.1 This is too early to judge</p> <p>2.1.3.1 There is no formal/consistent system for monitoring/auditing of teaching</p> <p>2.1.3.2 There is no research element / not applicable</p> <p>2.1.3.3 There is no evidence of connection with society</p> <p>2.1.3.4 Support services is through FORUM. Management is from the stake holders of the SoAE. No external assessment is in place</p> <p>2.1.4 It is too early to comment. There is no evidence of such a mechanism to promote a culture of quality</p>						
2.2	Ensuring Quality for the Programmes of Study	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the Programmes of Study offered by the Institution lies with the academic personnel.				x	
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the Programmes of Studies offered by the Institution are clear, sufficient and known to the students.				x	
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.		x			
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of Study.	x				
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.				x	
2.2.6	The Institutionalised procedures for examining students' objections / disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.		x			
2.2.7	The Institution publishes information related to the programmes of Study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of				x	

	studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of academic and teaching staff.					
2.2.8	The Institution has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of Studies offered.			x		
2.2.9	The Institution ensures that effective methodology is applied in the learning process.	x				
2.2.10	The Institution systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	x				
2.2.11	The Institution ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and / or international practices, particularly:	x				
2.2.11.1	Building facilities	x				
2.2.11.2	Library		x			
2.2.11.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons			x		
2.2.11.4	Technological Infrastructure	x				
2.2.11.5	Support structures for students with special needs and learning difficulties					x
2.2.11.6	Academic Support					x
2.2.11.7	Student Welfare Services					x
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>2.2.3 There is no quality control</p> <p>2.2.4 They do not do that</p> <p>2.2.6 There is no formal procedure or regulations, such disputes are resolved on personal level</p> <p>2.2.9 There is no evidence of any methodology and judgment of being effective or not</p> <p>2.2.10 There is no such mechanism</p> <p>2.2.11.1 Based on the previous comments</p> <p>2.2.11.2 There is some evidence for specialised catalogues being available but the reading list and textbooks provided on the various topics is rather minimum. No other resources appear to be available. There is no licence to big publishes, everything relies on free internet access</p> <p>2.2.11.4 Facilities/infrastructure are available for the minimum MOT certification and could be extended for something more concrete. However, no other engine or diagnostic test equipment/facilities are available or intended to be developed</p> <p>2.2.11.5-7: Currently ok but need to be re-assessed as the number of students grow</p> <p>Also, write the following, if they are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of students taking part in examinations <p>All students take exams</p>						

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Success exam rates of students Not available - Average grade of degree, percentage score breakdown Not available - Average duration of studies to obtain a degree Not available - Work assessments and percentage score/results analysis Not available - Percentage analysis of performance in Practice Exercise Not available - the ratio of students/teachers per subject, in theoretical and practical Subjects 						
3. ADMINISTRATION						
3.1	Administration	1	2	3	4	5
3.1.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation in force and the Institution's declared mission.				x	
3.1.2	The members of the academic and administrative staff and the students participate, at a satisfactory degree and on the basis of specified procedures, in the management of the Institution.			x		
3.1.3	Adequate allocation of competences and responsibilities is ensured so that in academic matters, decisions are made by academics and the Institution's Council competently exercises legal control over such decisions.			x		
3.1.4	The Institution applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.				x	
3.1.5	The Boards of Departments and Schools, as well as the institutionalised Committees of the Institution, operate systematically and exercise fully the responsibilities provided by legislation and / or the Constitution and / or the Internal Regulations of the Institution.	x				
3.1.6	The Council and the Senate operate systematically and autonomously and exercise the full powers provided for by the Statute and / or the Constitution of the Institution without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.					
3.1.7	The manner in which the Council and the Senate operate and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.					
3.1.8	The Institution applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, academic and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	x				
Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.						
3.1.5 Not applicable or no such boards in place						

3.1.6 Not relevant (no mark is given)
3.1.7 Not relevant (no mark is given)
3.1.8 There is no such mechanism, as everything is intended to be handed on personal level/discussion

4. TEACHING AND LEARNING

4.1	PLANNING THE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY	1	2	3	4	5
4.1.1	The Institution provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and revising Programmes of Study.	x				
4.1.2	An effective mechanism for evaluating programmes of Study is ensured by the students and the academic staff of the Institution.	x				
4.1.3	The Programmes of Study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	x				
4.1.4	The Institution ensures that its Programmes of Study integrate effectively theory and practice.				x	

Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.

4.1.1 There is programme in Greek for the 1st year. The programme in English is different, probably taken from another developed programme.
4.1.2 There is no such mechanism in place
4.1.3 It seems they do not meet the legal requirements for the academic qualifications of staff.

4.2	ORGANISATION OF TEACHING	1	2	3	4	5
4.2.1	The Institution establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.			x		
4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.			x		
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.		x			
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Institution have regular and effective communication with their students.			x		
4.2.5	The teaching staff of the Institution provide timely and effective feedback to their students.	x				

Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.

4.2.3 The planned space for drawing seems to have 16 desks; so the 20+ students will not fit
4.2.5 There is no mechanism for feedback to the students

5. ACADEMIC AND TEACHING STAFF

5.1	Suitability of Teaching staff qualifications	1	2	3	4	5
-----	--	---	---	---	---	---

5.1.1	The number of academic staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the Programmes of Study.			x		
5.1.2	The teaching staff of the Institution have the relevant formal and substantive qualifications for teaching the individual subjects as described in the relevant legislation.	x				
5.1.3	The Visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Institution's Programmes of Study.	x				
5.1.4	The Special Teaching Staff and Special Scientists have the required qualifications, sufficient professional experience and expertise to teach a limited number of Programmes of Study.			x		
5.1.5	The ratio of Special Reaching Staff and the members of the Academic Personnel is satisfactory.		x			
5.1.6	The ratio of the number of subjects of the Programme of study taught by academic staff working fulltime and exclusively to the number of subjects taught by part-time academic staff ensures the quality of the Programme of Study.			x		
5.1.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff is sufficient to support and ensure the quality of the Programme of Study.			x		
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>5.1.2 They do not meet the legislation</p> <p>5.1.3 There are no visiting staff/professors</p> <p>5.1.5 The special teaching staff ratio is probably too high compared. Academic staff are mainly part time, working as teachers in FORUM and recruited from there</p> <p>Write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of academic staff working full-time and having exclusive work Zero (0). Only PT staff - Number of Special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work 4 FT and 1 PT out of 4 FT total staff and 7 PT total staff) - Number of Visiting Professors 0 - Number of Special Scientists on lease services 0 						

6. RESEARCH / This section is not applicable						
6.1	Research	1	2	3	4	5
6.1.1	The Institution has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.					
6.1.2	The Institution consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.					
6.1.3	The Institution provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.					
6.1.4	Through its policy and practices, the Institution encourages research collaboration within and outside the Institution, as well as participation in collaborative research funding programmes.					
6.1.5	The Institution uses a policy for the protection and exploitation of intellectual property, which is applied consistently.					
6.1.6	The results of the academic staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Institution also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.					
6.1.7	The Institution ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.					
6.1.8	The Institution provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.					
6.1.9	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of academic staff is similar to other Institutions in Cyprus and abroad.					
6.1.10	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the academic staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.					
6.1.11	The Programmes of Study implement the Institution's recorded research policy.					
Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.						

7. RESOURCES						
7.1	RESOURCES	1	2	3	4	5
7.1.1	The institution has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Council/Senate.			x		
7.1.2	The Institution follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.			x		
7.1.3	The Institution's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	x				
7.1.4	The Institution's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.			x		
7.1.5	The Institution carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the Programmes of Study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	x				
7.1.6	The Institution's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.			x		
<p>Justify the numerical evaluation and write additional comments that you may have for this criterion.</p> <p>7.1.3 There is no evidence of re-investment back to the School</p> <p>7.1.5 There is no evidence of self or external assessment of the risks</p>						

CONCLUDING REMARKS – SUGGESTIONS

Write any comments and / or suggestions for the Institution as a whole or for individual components and criteria within the present evaluation.

The panel conducted a site visit and a thorough review of the documents provided, according to the regulations. Panel members asked a wide range of questions, which not only allowed the answers to the above questions to be determined but went beyond that, to understand the specific details and peculiarities of the School under evaluation.

The panel considers that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the overall objective of the institution. However, the implementation and execution of the programme of studies faces some issues, arising from the possible lack of leadership and academic understanding in the management. More specifically, the following shortcomings have been identified:

1. There is a lack of adequate knowledge on the legal requirements and regulations (for example, the percentage of teaching staff with diploma).
2. The level of academic courses proposed is not appropriate. For example, the level of maths given in the syllabus is too simple to allow students to address other modules, like thermodynamics and basic mechanics. There is no provision of very basic chemistry to obtain understanding of combustion and engine emissions. There is no provision for AutoCAD or other drawing packages. Similarly, the various practical tests are limited to existing equipment, which do not allow further tests that will help students to understand the engine/vehicle operation.
3. The lack of assessment criteria and feedback to/from the students and to/from the teaching staff is not available.
4. The panel concluded that successful operation will be strongly benefit from assistance of experts with engine and vehicle monitoring experience, that have a wide knowledge of the relevant technologies and future trends. Similarly, an independent advisory board would greatly help the operation.
5. The panel is concerned with the logo and layout of SoAE, which looks identical to SAE (the Society of Automotive Engineers), the largest international organisation on engines and vehicles with thousands of members.
6. The School's mission statement is not accurate and is completely misleading. The School will not graduate automotive engineers, as this term has a different meaning in the higher education sector in Cyprus and across the world; so it has to be replaced with a more appropriate term. Moreover, the School will not train professionals suited to the automotive industry; the graduates will be suited to the servicing and repair sector of the automotive aftermarket.

The panel concludes that a number of aspects with regards to the training and qualifications of the students cannot be evaluated until the first cohort of students has graduated. It further concludes that there is lack of academic leadership in the

designed programme of studies. Therefore, the panel recommends that an accreditation exercise should be performed again after the graduation of the first cohort of students.

Names and Signatures of the Chair and Members of the External Evaluation Committee:

Name:	Signature:
Prof Manolis Gavaises	
Prof Julian Dunne	
Prof John Allport	
Mr Konstantinos Odysseos	
Dr Christos Efstathiadis	
Ms Katerina Evangelou	

Date: 29/06/2018